

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-25 over Janow

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,061,570 to Janow ("Janow"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-15 recite a controller to activate an auto dialing calling module to send a notification message to a user upon satisfaction of a particular event based on call related information, wherein the satisfaction of the particular event is determined based on a comparison of one or more entries in the table to call related information contained in a log. Claims 16-23 recite a method and apparatus for logging a plurality of entries of call related information as it is received by a voice messaging system, and reviewing the entries of logged call related information for satisfaction of a predetermined event by one or more of the incoming calls based on the logged call related information. Claims 24 and 25 recite a calling module activated by receipt of predetermined call related information, the calling module being adapted to initiate a telephone call to a predetermined notification telephone number upon satisfaction of a predetermined event based on received call related information.

Janow teaches a unified message announcing system that causes a paging service to be contacted. (Janow, See, e.g., Abstract, and col. 2, lines 24-29) The undersigned has reviewed the entire text of Janow, and finds little information about what actually causes the page to be sent. What little information there is in Janow, it all relates to the content of a message itself, not to call related information such as Caller ID.

For instance, at col. 2, lines 33-36, Janow explains that "whenever **messages** arrive at the platforms that subscriber 23 wishes to know about" (emphasis added), that the paging system 20 is contacted. In the following paragraph, Janow explains that "the **message** is analyzed in block 101 to determine whether paging alert criteria have been met. The criteria may relate to

the identity of the sender, to an urgency code in the message, time of day, etc.” (emphasis added)

Clearly, at best, Janow discloses analysis of a **message** to determine whether or not paging criteria have been met. Janow fails to disclose use of call related information such as Caller ID information to determine paging criteria, **as recited by all claims of the present application.**

Moreover, claims 16-23 recite action based on a macro view of a number of calls, not just on the content of a single call. In particular, claims 16-23 recite logging a **plurality** of entries of **call related information** as it is received by a voice messaging system, and reviewing the **plurality** of entries of **logged call related information** for satisfaction of a predetermined event based on the **logged call related information**. This is a macro view based on an event built from more than one message. For instance, after 10 messages have been received.

Janow is focused on the content of a single message. In particular, Janow discloses analysis of a **single** message in Fig. 2, block 101, with associated brief description at col. 2, lines 45-48.

Janow fails to disclose logging and review of a **plurality** of call related information for determination of a paging notification, as recited by claims 16-22.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1-25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336